

THE
Great Ejection of 1662.

A LECTURE.

BY

J. M. CRAMP, D. D.

WITH AN APPENDIX

Published by request.

HALIFAX, N. S.
"CHRISTIAN MESSENGER" OFFICE.
1862.

5.-

THE
Great Ejectment of 1662.

A LECTURE.

BY

J. M. CRAMP, D. D.

WITH AN APPENDIX.

Published by request.

HALIFAX, N. S.
"CHRISTIAN MESSENGER" OFFICE.
1862.

274.2

C

TR

3219

Antman

July 189

\$5.00

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE "ACADIA ATHENÆUM."

Gentlemen :

The Lecture on "The Great Ejection of 1662," now published at your request, advocates principles which I trust will ever be held firmly by you. Persecution is so hateful, in all its forms, that an enlightened christian will shudder at the thought of encouraging it in the slightest degree. And it is as mean as it is hateful. How despicable is the conduct of that man, who, instead of answering his adversary's arguments, hands him over to the magistrate, to be plundered, according to law !

Allow me to indulge in a reminiscence or two. The first time that I ventured to appear in print was in the year 1818, and it was in connection with the subject of this lecture. A sermon on Acts v. 29, preached on the 24th of August in that year, was published, bearing the title "*Bartholomew Day Commemorated.*" Great changes have taken place since that time. Protestant Dissenters in England were then subjected to serious restraints and disabilities. Their marriages could only be celebrated in the episcopal churches. There was no legal registration of births and deaths. No persons were permitted to serve their king and country, or even to take office in a city or town-corporate, if they could not prove that they had received the Lord's Supper according to the forms of the Church of England. The divine ordinance, as Cowper said, (himself a member of that church,) was made "an office key, a pick-lock to a place." The exigencies of government, however, sometimes rendered necessary the employment of persons who had not complied with the requirement; and then the clumsy expedient of an "Indemnity Act" was adopted. Such an Act was passed at the commencement of every parliamentary session, graciously exempting from penalties those who had assumed public offices without "qualifying," as the phrase was,—that is, without using the "office key."

All these grievances have been redressed. We rejoice in our freedom. Let us thank God for the blessing, use it discreetly, and be always ready to help those who ask for a share.

I am, Gentlemen,

Your friend and well-wisher,

J. M. CRAMP.

Acadia College, Nov. 20, 1862.

th
T
T
ri
ti
th
th
ou
th
an
th
"
w
ch
sp
on
su
sc

ha
al
p
an
a

THE GREAT EJECTION OF 1662.

The Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century was the protest of the peoples of Europe against soul-slavery. They demanded freedom of thought, profession, and worship. They burst asunder the chains of the papacy, and claimed the right to serve God according to his word. Glowing anticipations of the future were indulged, "Gird thy sword upon thy thigh," exulting believers exclaimed, "O most mighty, with thy glory and thy majesty; and in thy majesty ride prosperously because of truth and meekness and righteousness, and thy right hand shall teach thee terrible things. Thine arrows are sharp in the heart of the king's enemies, whereby the people fall under thee." But the "sword" and the "arrows" were understood to be spiritual weapons, and the wounds were the wounds of the soul. Rightly-instructed christians, even in those days, would hurt no man's body nor spoil his estate, under pretext of defending religion. Their only desire was to see men broken in heart before God, and submissive to the laws of Immanuel. That submission they sought to secure by moral suasion and the power of prayer.

Unhappily, the management of the enterprise fell into the hands of men who had not shaken off old prejudices, and who allowed themselves to be controlled by the adherents of worldly policy. The Reformation was shorn of its glory when rulers and statesmen took the lead. What sympathy had *they* with a kingdom which is "not of this world," or with a sovereign

whose subjects must not "fight" for him? It was their vocation to compel, not to persuade. They must have law, and penalty, and force. Instead of appealing to the heart and the conscience, they would point to the statute book, the prison, and the scaffold.

And they did so. Different politics were adopted:—the creeds of the Lutherans and the Reformed were discordant on various points, and neither would commune with the other. But there was a fearful agreement in the use of coercion and restraint. Both sought establishment from the civil power. Both demanded exclusive privileges. The Lutheran would not tolerate the Reformed nor the Reformed the Lutheran. Neither of them would allow the Anabaptist (as they called him) to dwell in their borders. They claimed the right to fine, imprison, banish, burn, hang or drown all who could not pronounce their Shibboleth.

When England received the Reformation, it was in this way. There was no proclamation of freedom to the people, nor was their consent to the change asked. They were bidden to be Protestants because the State had adopted Protestantism. They were commanded to serve God in a prescribed form or suffer the consequences. Henry VIII. was neither Protestant nor Papist, and so it would be unfair to cite *his* laws. But the introduction of Protestant worship under Edward VI. was signalised by the ordinary legal sanctions. The parish churches were the appointed places of religious assembly, and no other prayers were to be offered in them than those which were enjoined by authority, the use of them being enforced by fine and imprisonment. The restoration of the kingdom to the Pope's rule was distinguished by still sharper penalties, agreeably to the genius and spirit of the "mystery of iniquity." This excites no surprise because it was natural. But the re-establishment of the purer faith and service, on the accession of Elizabeth, revealed no progress. It was fine and imprison-

ment, still. The Romish interpretation of the Lord's words in the parable was adopted in practice, and "compel them to come in" became the motto of a Protestant government.

The first Reformers beheld men "as trees walking." Emerging from the thick darkness of Romanism their eyes were dazzled by the brightness into which they were brought, and their vision was imperfect. When they became accustomed to the light some of them saw things clearly, but unfortunately the plans and public procedure were formed, and whatever might have been their convictions they were unable to reduce them to practice. The governments of those parts of Europe which had embraced Protestantism assumed the management of religious affairs. Subjects were but little considered in those days; they were expected to believe as their princes believed, and to worship as they were commanded. Neglect or non-compliance incurred punishment. It was in vain that the rights of conscience were pleaded. It was the age of *duties*, not of *rights*; and was it not the duty of subjects to obey?

No one had a deeper impression on that point than Queen Elizabeth. She was a woman of imperious mind, impatient of contradiction, and intent on maintaining the dignity of the crown. It was a right royal thing to lord it over men, and to mark out the path for them to walk in. Elizabeth bowed down to the idol, uniformity, and could not brook the refusal of any to join in the general prostration. We may imagine, therefore, her disgust and fury when the exiled reformers who had taken refuge on the Continent during her sister Mary's burnings returned home half converted to Presbyterianism. They were ill affected to diocesan episcopacy; they demurred greatly to the proceedings of the bishops' courts; they protested against the sign of the cross in baptism, kneeling at the Lord's supper, and the use of the surplice and other ecclesiastical habits; and they demanded liberty of prayer, refusing to be tied down to one set of forms, and to be denied the power

of alteration. These were the first puritans, and many in England sympathized with them. They tried the experiment of mingling obedience to authority with freedom, hoping that the lady at the head of the church would accept a general adhesion without insisting on strict regard to the minutiae of of service. But they were mistaken. Elizabeth's fondness for pomp and power stood in their way. Her views and inclinations were rather Romish than Protestant, and it was a monstrous thing in her eyes that any man should presume to impeach her wisdom or deem even the least of her requirements superfluous. She was inflexible. The habits must be worn; knees must bow; not an iota must be omitted. Submission or expulsion was the order of the day, although it was apparent that some of the best men in the kingdom were on the puritan side, and that the rigid exaction of uniformity would rob numbers of parishes of the blessings of the gospel ministry. The evils apprehended were soon felt. Fifteen hundred clergymen were suspended or deprived during Elizabeth's reign. The church fell into distress and confusion. Good men indulged in the gloomiest forebodings, while the enemies of truth and godliness shouted for joy.

Then commenced the conflict which for an entire century embittered society throughout England and produced an incalculable amount of misery. The sovereign, as head of the church, required absolute submission on the part of the clergy, and refused to consent to any relaxation of the demand. Numbers of the clergy, on the other hand, asked for further reformation, or for a limited discretion in the use of ceremonies. When they failed to obtain the liberty prayed for, and still forbore to conform, the arm of the law fell upon them and they were driven from their posts. For a long time they abstained from instituting separate worship, fearing the guilt of schism, and hoping that a favourable consideration might yet be given to their requests. Necessity at length compelled

them to take the final step. If the endowed church closed her doors upon them and steeled her heart against their remonstrances, might they not worship God elsewhere, and set up an altar according to the heavenly pattern? So they reasoned. But when they carried out their reasoning into practice the myrmidons of power pounced upon them. Obsequious legislatures were willing to gratify the wishes of the royal despot, and godly men found that assemblies for holiest purposes were treated as riotous and rebellious gatherings, subjecting those who took part in them to severe losses or degrading punishments. By the Act "to retain the Queen's subjects in their due obedience," every person who neglected to attend church forfeited twenty pounds per month, and schoolmasters similarly neglectful were to be fined ten pounds per month, be disabled from teaching school, and suffer a year's imprisonment. By the Act "for the punishment of persons obstinately refusing to come to church," all who should so refuse for one month, or who should "be present at any unlawful assembly, conventicle, or meeting, under colour or pretence of any exercise of religion," were adjudged to imprisonment till they should conform and submit; if they did not submit within three months, they were to "abjure the realm and go into perpetual banishment;" if they did not depart within the time limited, or if they returned without leave, they were to "suffer death without benefit of clergy." In order to give effect to these and other enactments the Courts of High Commission and Star Chamber were constituted, which by their cruel and illegal proceedings spread universal dismay and at last inflamed the indignation of the people to such a pitch that the throne itself was swept away in the uproar. Such a result can scarcely be wondered at, for "oppression maketh a wise man mad." The case of the dissidents was hard beyond example. While they were *in* the church they were punished for disobedience. When they went *out* of it they were punished for their separ-

ation. If they sought to defend themselves by means of the Press, the Press was placed under restraint;—if they evaded that restraint and succeeded in publishing their thoughts, they were punished for sedition or libel. If they remained in the country, a life of continual suffering was before them;—if they left it, it was at the risk of encountering distress in new and fearful forms;—and when numbers had exposed themselves to that risk, and others were prepared to follow their example, royal authority interposed to prevent them, that the objects of vengeance might be still retained within its grasp. They were “scattered and peeled,” always and everywhere. With these facts before us, instead of affecting any surprise at the proceedings of the Long Parliament, or inquiring whether they were in every instance defensible, we may rather express our commendation of the prolonged forbearance of an outraged people. Their pent-up fury discharged itself fiercely enough on the heads of some of the delinquents, but the retaliation, as a whole, came far short of the insult and injury inflicted.

The time of the Commonwealth was eminently peculiar, not to be judged of by the tastes and views of the nineteenth century. The conduct of the men of that period was shaped by the extraordinary nature of the crisis, and must not be tried by our standard. We cannot fairly decide respecting the course they adopted unless we endeavour to place ourselves in their circumstances, and thus learn to sympathise with them in their painful experience. Nor must we allow the outcry against enthusiasm and fanaticism to deceive us. There were enthusiasts and fanatics in those days, no doubt—and hypocrites, too; as there always are in seasons of great excitement, religious or political. And it may be granted that there were grave errors in some of the public proceedings of the Commonwealth and Protectorate. The leaders were sincere men, and terribly earnest in their sincerity. But they had endured the peltings of the storm during the tyrannies of the first James

and the first Charles, and when they entered on public life, all battered and bruised by the tempest, they felt little charity for those who had invoked it. What wonder was it if, when power came into their own hands they used it with some sternness?—We censure them for their intolerance, and rightly; yet may not that intolerance, though not to be excused, be palliated by the consideration of the wrongs they had endured, as well as of the general dearth of christian feeling on the subject? With the exception of the Baptists, the Independents, and the Quakers, all Christendom was at that time imbued with the persecuting spirit. Every sect was prepared to give the magistrate power to put down every other sect, and each in its turn exclaimed against the cruelties of the rest and deplored its own melancholy lot. The Church of England persecuted and wasted the puritanic body; the puritans, in return, crushed the Church of England, which, when it recovered strength and pride of place laid its iron hand on all parties, and mauled them most unmercifully. They were all wrong—the Presbyterian no less than the Episcopalian—the Episcopalian no less than the Presbyterian; and their wrong-doing was the more criminal because of its Protestant aspect. The Romish church has burned and beheaded heretics on principle;—when Protestants tread in her steps they act in opposition to principle.

At the accession of Charles II. the state of religious affairs in England was truly anomalous. Episcopacy had been abolished and Presbyterianism put in its place; nominally, at least. That is the utmost that can be said, for in the majority of parishes the ministers did what was right in their own eyes, only they were forbidden to use the Common Prayer Book. The Presbyterian framework, however, was set up in only a few counties. In the rest, though most of the ministers were of the Presbyterian order, they acted on their individual responsibility, there being no presbyteries to which reports or

appeals could be made. Some few of the ministers were Independents, and some, Baptists.* Here and there a man was to be found who retained his position amidst all changes, and was willing to sign any articles or enter into any engagement so that he might keep his parish. All these received the tithes and other ecclesiastical dues which constituted the 'livings' of the church. That Church was still considered, in its temporal form, as a national institute. Its wealth was for the most part untouched, and the emoluments which the parochial funds supplied were enjoyed by those who were in actual possession. They had been put in possession by the existing government when the old incumbents were cast out, which was either for bad behaviour, for insufficiency, or for refusal to promise allegiance and fidelity. At the restoration of Charles II., those incumbents who survived re-entered into possession of their livings and ousted the new occupants. But a large number of parishes were still held by Presbyterian ministers or by men who, though they were willing to remain under episcopal rule, in some modified form, were desirous of considerable changes in the worship and ceremonies of the church. Here, then, was a fine opportunity for conciliation. Such a conjuncture of affairs might not be expected to occur again. The controversy which had been raging ever since the time of Elizabeth might be settled on terms satisfactory to all reasonable persons. The demands made might be conceded without trenching in the least on the claims of conscience, since, however firm the attachment felt by some to certain formularies, it could not be maintained that they were bound by divine authority to the use of them. Besides this, the king had issued a Declaration from Breda a short time previous to his restoration, in which he expressly promised "liberty to tender consciences, and that no man should be disquieted or called in question for differences

*See Appendix, No. I.

of opinion in matters of religion, which did not disturb the peace of the kingdom." Was there not, therefore, ground for hoping that a friendly and equitable adjustment might be accomplished, involving, possibly, some slight compromises on each side, yet securing the long-desired unity and fixing the church on a firmer foundation than ever?

There was the greater reason for this hope in that the requirements of the Presbyterians and the reforming portion of the clergy were exceedingly moderate. They were content, as has been mentioned, to submit to episcopal government, even though certain modifications which they desired were not conceded, if the validity of their own ordinations was granted. In regard to other things, they asked for liberty to baptize without using the sign of the cross—to administer the Lord's supper to communicants either kneeling, sitting, or standing—and to officiate without wearing the surplice. They wished also to be relieved from the obligation to "pronounce all baptized persons regenerated by the Holy Ghost, whether they were the children of christians or not"—to administer the Lord's supper to those who were unfit to receive it—and to give thanks indiscriminately for all whom they buried, as "brethren whom God had taken to himself." And they objected to subscribe a declaration that there was nothing in the Common Prayer Book, the Book of Ordinations, or the thirty-nine articles, contrary to the word of God. If they could be indulged in these particulars, and if some objectionable expressions in the liturgical services were revised and altered, they were willing to conform to the church as by law established. Now it must be confessed that in agreeing to exercise their ministry in the church on these terms they made large concessions. But on the other hand, concessions to very nearly the same amount had been promised by the king in a Declaration issued October 25th, 1660. A friendly settlement of the whole controversy appeared, therefore, close at hand. Had

the force of law been given to the Declaration, the ejection would not have taken place, and the Church of England would have retained the services of hundreds of men, by whose labours her spiritual influence on the population would have been wonderfully increased. It had been determined beforehand, however, to yield nothing. Parliament refused, as was anticipated and planned, to ratify the royal Declaration. A number of minor alterations, not touching the great points at issue, having been made in the Prayer Book, under colour of meeting the views of objectors, a new edition of the book was ordered to be prepared, and its use was made obligatory by the celebrated Act of Uniformity, which went into operation August 24, 1662.

The provisions of that enactment were to the following effect, viz :—

1. That those ministers who had not been episcopally ordained should be re-ordained.
2. That they should declare their unfeigned assent and consent to all and every thing contained in the book of Common Prayer and administration of sacraments and other rites and ceremonies of the Church of England, together with the Psalter, and the form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of bishops, priests and deacons.
3. That they should take the oath of canonical obedience to the bishops.
4. That they should abjure the solemn league and covenant.
5. That they should subscribe a declaration of the unlawfulness of taking up arms against the king, or those commissioned by him, "upon any pretence whatsoever."

The authors and promoters of the Act of Uniformity had one object in view, which they pursued with relentless determination, not unmingled with craft and duplicity. King, privy-council, bishops, parliament men were leagued together for the destruction of the Presbyterians, and of those who acted with them. They were beguiled by a pretended Conference for the adjustment of differences, and then handed over, stripped and

defenceless, to the vengeance of the law. That vengeance fell upon them with terrific force.

The penalties of the Act were severe. Neglect to make the prescribed declarations exposed the individual to immediate deprivation. Every person who should "consecrate and administer the holy sacrament of the Lord's supper before he was ordained a priest by episcopal ordination," forfeited one hundred pounds for each offence. No minister was to be allowed to preach unless he was licensed by the archbishop or bishops, and had publicly declared his "assent and consent," as above: in default whereof he was "disabled to preach," and was liable to three months imprisonment every time he preached while so "disabled." The penal statutes regarding religion, passed in Queen Elizabeth's time, were also continued in force.

All this was slight and insignificant compared with what followed, as will presently appear. On St. Bartholomew's day, Aug. 24th, 1662, upwards of *two thousand* ministers were cast out of the Church of England by the Act of Uniformity. We say, "cast out," because the terms of continuance were purposely so contrived as to ensure their removal. As they could not conscientiously comply with the terms it was impossible for them to remain. And no provision was made for them. The "scandalous and insufficient" ministers who were removed during the Commonwealth were entitled to the fifths of the revenues of their benefices; but the Nonconformists and their families were thrown upon the world in a state of utter destitution. Yet this miserable prospect did not deter them. They "counted the cost." They believed that they were called to take up the cross and follow their Lord, and they did so, in the face of poverty and punishment.

It would have been a hard measure if they had been merely turned out of house and home. But that did not satisfy the furies of those times. If, when expelled from the churches

the servants of God preached elsewhere, met the attached members of their former flocks for purposes of christian fellowship, or adopted other measures for the diffusion of their principles, the state-church might incur great detriment. They must be silenced. And the law doomed them to silence. By the Conventicle Act (A. D. 1664), all persons present at any religious meeting, not conducted according to the forms of the Church of England, if five persons more than the household were there, were to be imprisoned three months, or pay five pounds; for the second offence, six months, or ten pounds; for the third offence, to be banished for seven years to some of the American plantations, "excepting New England and Virginia" (*where they might find friends!*), or pay one hundred pounds; the penalty for return or escape from banishment—*death!* By the Five Mile Act (A. D. 1665), Nonconformist ministers were forbidden to enter any city, town corporate, or borough, or to be found within five miles of the same or within five miles of any place where they formerly officiated, or where they had preached since the Act of Uniformity, unless they took an oath declaratory of the unlawfulness of taking up arms against the king, upon any pretence whatsoever, and of their own intention to endeavour no alteration of the government, either in church or state:—penalty, forty pounds. The second Conventicle Act (A. D. 1670), was still more barbarous. All persons present at unlawful religious meetings were to be fined five shillings each for the first offence, and ten shillings for the second; the "preachers or teachers" to be fined twenty pounds each; the owners of the premises, twenty pounds each. The fines were to be levied by distress and sale, by any justice of the peace, on the oath of two witnesses, "or any other sufficient proof;" and the proceeds were to be divided into three parts, one third for the king, one third for the poor, and one third "to the informer or his assistants, regard being had to their diligence

and industry in discovering, dispersing, and punishing the said conventicle." If any justice of the peace refused to do his duty he was to be fined five pounds; and the Act was to be "*construed most largely and beneficially for the suppressing of conventicles, and for the justification and encouragement of all persons to be employed in the execution thereof!*"

These laws, it will be observed, were not confined to those who had been ejected from the Church of England, and their adherents. They affected all dissidents, of every name, the Independents, the Baptists, the Quakers and others. No man was to "worship God contrary to the law." If he dared to pray, or to praise God, to instruct others, or to receive instruction, in any other manner than the Act of Uniformity enjoined, he must suffer the consequences, in purse, or person, or both. And the penalties of the Act, were enforced on all who should teach children without submitting themselves and declaring their adhesion to the church. Thus the minister was prevented from becoming a schoolmaster, and by that means procuring a livelihood. Every avenue was to be shut against him. He must conform—or go into exile—or die.

The sufferings which befel the Nonconformists in consequence of these Acts, during the reign of Charles II. and James II. were altogether without parallel. At first, the ministers only were the victims. Preaching the gospel in contravention of the law was a crime. Men might not be exhorted to repentance nor trained in piety by those who were not recognised as regular ministers of the Church of England. All others ran the risk of fine and imprisonment; and then, when the fine was paid or the imprisonment terminated, the oath already referred to was required to be taken, or they were called on to give security for "good behaviour," which "good behaviour" was construed to mean abstinence from preaching—a condition to which they could not submit. Protracted impris-

onment followed, often lasting for years, and in many instances closed only by death.

But the people were bent on the maintenance of their principles. By dint of ingenious management they frequently baffled the designs of the persecutor. The minister was disguised; or he preached in a room with a hole in the wall, through which his hearers, seated in another room, listened to him; or a trap-door was so placed that in the event of disturbance he might slip through it and be concealed elsewhere. Enraged at the failure of their plans, the enemies of truth and freedom adopted more violent measures. Heavier fines were levied. The old laws of Elizabeth were put into rigorous execution. Informers drove a thriving trade in those days. They diligently plied their infamous occupation, and spent the day of the Lord in prowling about for their prey—listening at doors and windows, if haply they might hear the voice of prayer or exhortation—or scouring the fields and woods in search of christian meetings. Like Saul of Tarsus they were “exceedingly mad” against the servants of the Lord, although they went beyond him in one respect, for we do not read that he enriched himself at the expense of the objects of his malice. But those wretched men fattened on the spoils, or wasted the substance so unrighteously acquired, in drunkenness and debauchery.

A brief reference to individual cases will give some idea of the scenes that were enacted, and the desolation that spread over the land.

Ralph Button was imprisoned six months for giving private lessons to the sons of two gentlemen, at Brentford, near London.—Dr. Wilkinson’s library was seized and sold to pay the fines levied on him for preaching.—Nathaniel Vincent, when put in prison, was not allowed the use of pen, ink or paper; he was not even permitted to write to his wife.—Joseph Sherwood was sent to jail for preaching in a church when there was a large congregation assembled, and no other minister

present, so that the people would have been deprived of a sermon if he had not occupied the pulpit. His discourse was founded on Levit. xxvi. 25.—“And I will bring a sword upon you, that shall avenge the quarrel of my covenant”:—when this was reported to the magistrate he exclaimed, “did ever man preach from such a rebellious text?”—James Burdwood was fined twenty pounds for preaching in his own house to five persons besides the family, and twenty pounds for using the house for that purpose.—Edmund Tucker was fined thirty pounds for praying with three ladies who were paying a visit of condolence to his wife on account of the death of her only son; and on another occasion his furniture was carried away, even the bed and bedding, and his children’s clothes.—Certain christian people at Cranbrook, Kent, having met to pray that the ejection of so many excellent ministers might be sanctified to them, were fined for so praying, and committed to Maidstone jail for three months in default of payment. William Jenkyn, an aged minister, was spending a day in prayer with other ministers and friends, when the meeting was broken up by the police, and Mr. Jenkyn committed to Newgate, the London prison. On his petitioning the king for release, physicians having testified that his life would be in danger if he continued in confinement, the king replied, “Jenkyn shall be a prisoner as long as he lives.” In that instance Charles kept his word. Four months afterwards the mourning rings distributed at the funeral bore this inscription, “Mr. William Jenkyn; murdered in Newgate.” John Thompson died in prison at Bristol. George Towner, pastor of the Baptist Church at Broadmead, Bristol, died in Gloucester jail, after an imprisonment of two years and a half. Francis Bampffield, another Baptist minister, who had suffered eight years’ imprisonment in Dorchester jail, died in Newgate. Thomas Delaune, a schoolmaster, also a Baptist, wrote an excellent work, entitled “A plea for the Nonconformists,” in

reply to a sermon by Dr. Benjamin Calamy, a London clergyman. Before it was published, Mr. Delaune was apprehended and committed to Newgate, where he was tried and convicted of writing, printing, and publishing "a false, seditious, and scandalous libel," fined a hundred marks (£66 16s. 8d. sterling), and ordered to be kept in prison till the fine was paid and security found for his good behaviour. Unable to pay his fine he languished in prison, dependent on casual charity, his wife and two young children sharing in his misery and privation, till at length they all died there. Vavasor Powell, a truly apostolic man, whose labours in Wales were crowned with remarkable success, died in prison in London, in the eleventh year of his imprisonment. A number of Nonconformists were holding a fast on account of an extraordinary drought which then prevailed, and were discovered by the informers:—Edward Bury, a minister, was fined twenty pounds, though he did not preach, and on his refusing to pay the fine, "his goods, books, and even the bed he lay upon" were taken away;—Philip Henry, another minister, father of Matthew Henry, the Commentator, was fined forty pounds, for which he was plundered of a large amount of property;—the owner of the house was fined twenty pounds;—and five shillings apiece were exacted from one hundred and fifty persons who were present at the meeting. John Bunyan, the immortal dreamer, whom now all denominations delight to honour, was immured twelve years in Bedford jail for preaching the gospel of Christ.

The perils, privations and sufferings encountered during those years of persecution would scarcely command belief if they were not amply attested. Ministers of God's word were hunted up and down the country as if they were highwaymen or murderers. They often spent the night in the Lord's service, travelling in the dark to some retired spot, where they met christian friends and worshipped with them

till the dawning of the day warned them to separate, lest they should be discovered. The terrible sentence of excommunication was pronounced against many of them, by which all civil rights were taken away, and even access to the churches was denied them—and then they were fined and plundered for not going to church! So hot was the pursuit on some occasions that they assumed other names to avoid detection. They hid themselves in the most secret places they could find, never remaining long in one house, and were sometimes literally reduced to such straits that they had not where to lay their heads. A Nonconformist preacher was in greater peril of liberty and life than the worst rogues and vagabonds that roamed the country.

WHAT KIND OF MEN WERE THOSE NONCONFORMISTS?

If the inquiry relate to their intellectual requirements, we may reply by telling of Dr. Seaman, who always carried a small Hebrew bible with him for ordinary use;—of William Wickens, to whom the originals of the Old and New Testaments were so familiar that he read them chiefly in his private devotions; of Edmund Calamy, who had read the whole of Augustine's works five times;—of Samuel Lee, who spoke Latin fluently and elegantly;—of Matthew Poole, the learned compiler of the *Synopsis Criticorum*;—of John Rowe, who “had such a knowledge of Greek, that he began very young to keep a diary in that language, which he continued till his death;”—of Thomas Gilbert, who “had all the Schoolmen at his finger's end;”—of George Moxon, who “was a good lyric poet, and could imitate Horace so exactly as not easily to be distinguished;”—of Samuel Tapper, of whom it is said that “Latin poetry was his amusement during his silence”—that “he could read the Greek poets and philosophers as familiarly as if he had been reading English”—and that “he had the Greek Testament by heart, and would, upon any occasion that

offered, instantly repeat the text and criticize upon it, as if the book lay open before him";—of John Harmar, who translated the Assembly's Catechism into Greek and Latin;—of Matthew Clark, who was not only well versed in the Classics and in Oriental learning, but actually "learned the modern Persian after he was sixty-six years of age";—of Richard Heath, who corrected the Syriac and Arabic versions of the Scriptures, published in Walton's Polyglot;—of Philip Henry, who assisted Dr. Busby in preparing his Greek Grammar;—of Joseph Truman, whose "head supplied the place of a Lexicon, for he was able to give all the senses of any Greek word, where any thing of moment depended upon it, and to produce authorities, both out of sacred and profane authors";—of Thomas Hill, who when he went to the University of Cambridge to pursue his studies, "was so expert in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, that he was owned to be superior to most of the tutors";—and of such great men as Theophilus Gale, John Howe, Dr. Owen and others, who were very giants in learning.

If the enquiry be, whether these learned men published any works which were calculated to promote piety as well as learning, and might be expected to be useful in after ages, we may refer to such books as Charnock on the Attributes; Owen on Spiritual-mindedness,—on Communion with God,—on the Glory of Christ, &c., &c; Flavel's "Fountain of Life," and other valuable productions; Howe's "Blessedness of the righteous," "Spiritual Temple," &c.; Brookes's "Mute Christian under the smarting rod," and "Precious remedies against Satan's devices"; Marshall's "Gospel Mystery of Sanctification"; Ambrose's "Looking to Jesus"; Mead's "Almost Christian"; Alleine's "Alarm to the unconverted"; Steel's "Husbandman's Calling"; Baxter's "Reformed Pastor," "Call to the unconverted," "Saint's Everlasting Rest," and other works, too numerous to be mentioned. Christians in the nineteenth century are continually instructed, edified and

comforted by the productions of the writers of the seventeenth. The *suffering* age was made to furnish food for the *busy* one.

If it be further asked whether, besides using their pens in this manner, these excellent men laboured otherwise for the advancement of truth and piety, ample information may be supplied. They were generally pains-taking and indefatigable pastors; and as preachers of the gospel, both in preparation and practice, they marvellously excelled, and were blessed with great usefulness. Samuel Clark, a voluminous author, spent nine years in the town of Leicester, which, before he settled there was known by the epithet "drunken," but became distinguished for sobriety and religion during his ministry.—Thomas Vincent, who committed to memory the whole of the New Testament and the Psalms, because, he said, those "who took from him his pulpit might in time demand his bible also," devoted himself, when the great plague raged in London, in 1665, to preaching in the parish churches, visiting the sick, and every kind of effort by which relief might be afforded and souls saved;—multitudes flocked to hear him, and great numbers were brought to God.—Dr. Staunton, designated "the searching preacher," one of the most laborious ministers of those times, "was constantly projecting and executing schemes for the honour of God," and would often say to his friends, "Come, what shall we do for God to-day?"—Dr. Thomas Goodwin, "a very considerable scholar and an eminent divine," had purposed, when he commenced his ministry, to adorn his sermons with such flowers of wit and eloquence as he might gather from the best writings, ancient and modern; but the grace of God wrought such a change in him that a very different resolution was formed, "and in the end," he says, "this project of wit and vain-glory was wholly sunk in my heart, and I left all, and have continued in that purpose and practice these threescore years—and I never was so much as tempted to put into a sermon my own withered flowers that I had

gathered, and valued more than diamonds, but have preached what I thought was truly edifying, either for conversion of souls, or bringing them up to eternal life."—John Howe, whose sermons displayed uncommon depth of thought, and who was a great man among the great, gave himself up to the work of God with such devotedness and holy solicitude as have been rarely witnessed. The manner in which he conducted the service on fast-days would hardly be imitated now, but shewed great powers of endurance, both in the minister and the people. It is thus described ;—" He began at nine o'clock with a prayer of a quarter of an hour—read and expounded scripture for about three quarters—prayed an hour—preached another—then prayed half an hour. The people then sung about a quarter of an hour, during which he retired and took a little refreshment. He then came into the pulpit again—prayed an hour more—preached another hour—and then with a prayer of half an hour concluded the service."—When Richard Baxter went to Kidderminster, "there might perhaps be a family in a street that worshipped God"; when he left it, "there was not above a family on the side of a street that did not do it." There were six hundred communicants in his church, and in nearly all the houses in the town his services were gratefully accepted, "for private catechising and personal conference."—This list might be almost indefinitely extended; let it suffice to mention one more illustrious name. Joseph Alleine, whose "Alarm to the Unconverted" has been circulated by hundreds of thousands, and has been the means of conversion to vast numbers, was a man of seraphic godliness. "At the time of his health," writes his wife, "he did constantly rise at or before four of the clock, and would be much troubled if he heard smiths or other craftsmen at work at their trades before he was at communion with God; saying to me often, 'How this noise shames me! Doth not my Master deserve more than theirs?' From four till eight he spent in prayer, holy con-

temptation, and singing of psalms, in which he much delighted, and did daily practice alone, as well as in his family." His ministerial life at Taunton was a series of holy, unremitting toils, "both publicly and from house to house." When the Act of Uniformity displaced him he laboured yet the harder, preaching wherever he could get the people together for that purpose, because he feared that he might soon have only the prison for a meeting-house. "In these months," says Mrs. Alleine, "I know that he hath preached fourteen times in eight days, ten often, and six or seven ordinarily, at home and abroad, besides his frequent converse with souls—he then, laying aside all other studies which he formerly so much delighted in, because he accounted his time would be short." Prison experience followed. Confined in jail with thirteen other ministers, all, like himself, charged with the high crime of preaching the gospel in a manner forbidden by law, his first act was to preach and pray, which he called, "holding a consecration service." "Subsequently, and to the last, he and his companions in turn preached and prayed publicly once, and sometimes twice, every day, the minister generally speaking through the prison-bars to the congregation that flocked from the various villages within a distance of ten miles. All the rest of the day he constantly spent in converse with those who thronged to him for counsel and instruction, and in consequence of this he was forced to take much of the night for study and secret converse with God."*

Such was the character of this noble band—such their labors and their sufferings. And the people by whom they were encouraged and sustained were worthy of them. They "took joyfully the spoiling of their goods." There was plenty of it. The grain was borne off from the fields—the cattle from the stall—the furniture from the house—even the very

*Stanford's "Joseph Alleine and his Times," pp. 156, 209, 221. See Appendix, No. II.

beds from under the sick. Thousands of them suffered in person as well as in property. An accurate and full enumeration of losses is not attainable, and an estimator may therefore err, in excess or defect, according to the ground on which it is founded, or even the bias of the individual by whom it is made. Competent judges, however, have recorded their conclusions, based on facts, and they are thus summarily expressed:—

“Within the compass of three years, the Dissenters of England suffered, in penalties inflicted for the worship of God, the amount of two millions sterling. From the Restoration to the Revolution, these losses from the same causes rose to twelve or fourteen millions. In the same space of time, sixty thousand persons are said to have suffered on a religious account. * * * These sufferings included fines, bonds, transportation, voluntary exile to Holland or America, and death in prison. The number of such deaths is variously estimated, from 5000 to 8000. It is impossible for us to know with certainty the statistics of that black record until the books are opened at the judgment day.”*

And now, it may be asked, why is this horrible story raked up again? What purpose is to be served by bringing afresh to the light these atrocious deeds? Would it not be far better to allow them to remain in the oblivion to which they have been by common consent consigned for many years past? We reply, emphatically, No! They cannot—must not—ought not to be forgotten. They form part of England's history, and the omission would be fatal to the impartiality of the historian. They were the working out of a politico-religious experiment on the patience of the English people and their capability of enduring oppression, on the success or failure of which great interests were staked. The result deserves to be chronicled in letters of fire. But it cannot be understood or appreciated

*Stanford, p. 383.

unless the whole process be revealed. The revelation may be distasteful to some whose predecessors were engaged in the conspiracy against English freedom, but strict justice demands that the story shall be frequently told, so that our children and our children's children may be sufficiently informed on the subject, and well guarded against any attempt to introduce opinions or practices which may tend to revive the disorders and oppressions of the seventeenth century.

Nor let it be imagined that our object is to excite hostility to the Church of England. All Christendom is under obligation to that Church, or rather to the many great men whom it has produced, by whose labours the common faith has been triumphantly defended, and invaluable aid rendered to those who are engaged in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. Likeminded men, we trust, will continue to be raised up in successive generations, prepared to do battle for truth and holiness, and to stand in the ranks with other combatants in the spiritual warfare, fighting side by side with christian soldiers of every name. But however we may honour and esteem individual members of that Church, and rejoice, too, in the evangelical spirit which now animates a large portion of her clergy, it is neither wise nor right to keep out of view certain facts in her history and certain peculiarities in her position, on which Christianity itself must pronounce its verdict. The inquiry therefore is, what was accomplished for the Church of England by the Act of Uniformity? The injury sustained by the Church, through the operation of the Act is not now under consideration. It would be a melancholy tale. For the loss of two thousand able, honest, conscientious ministers could not be easily repaired. Fit successors were not to be found; the places of the ejected were for a long time filled by men of a vastly inferior stamp, and in numerous instances sadly inefficient and unworthy. It was the rudest shock the church had ever sustained. Many, many years passed away before she

recovered her strength. In fact, she staggered under the blow for more than a century. But passing this by, our present inquiry is, What was accomplished for the Church of England by the Act of Uniformity? Apparently, it stereotyped that Church for all time coming. No man can now obtain a benefice therein who does not declare his "unfeigned assent and consent to all and every thing" contained in the Common Prayer Book, besides his subscription to the Articles. The clergy of the Church of England are understood, as they are required, to believe that in baptism the infant is "made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven," being "regenerated by the Holy Spirit",—that they have authority to say to a penitent sick person, "I absolve thee from all thy sins,"—and that every one at whose funeral they officiate is a "dear brother" or "sister," for whose deliverance from "the miseries of this sinful world" they give God hearty thanks. All this they must affirm, without variation or omission; and in celebrating divine service they must conform strictly to prescribed rules and modes, adding nothing, however appropriate the addition might be. The oaths of supremacy and of canonical obedience bind them to obey the behests of the Queen and of their respective bishops, in things spiritual, while, so far as legislation is concerned, they are compelled to accept the decrees of the Imperial Parliament.

It is well known that great numbers of the truest friends of the Church are dissatisfied with her present position. We sympathise with them in their difficulties and trials. They lament the want of uniformity that prevails among their own clergy, notwithstanding the requisitions of the celebrated Act. Some are high church; some, low church; some, broad church. Some believe in baptismal regeneration; others believe it not, or preach as if they do not believe it. Some encourage auricular confession; others abhor it, some (we trust

a majority) hold firmly those truths to which the appellation "evangelical" is ordinarily prefixed; but many, it is to be feared, have "erred concerning the faith," giving heed to "vain babblings, and oppositions of science, falsely so called," or have substituted for the doctrines of the cross the "beggarly elements" of superstition, or a cold and heartless morality. These things cause pungent grief. And those who mourn over these evils are further distressed on account of the bondage to which they are doomed. Their Church, they say, is powerless. Her people cannot choose their own ministers, but must receive those who are sent them by the patrons. Her clergy take no part in the choice of bishops, who are appointed by the prime minister of the day. Godly discipline, they add, is utterly in abeyance. The church can neither exclude error nor suppress vice, for the ultimate appeal is to Parliament or the Privy Council; and decisions are based on the thirty-nine Articles or the statutes of the realm—not on the word of God.

Other grievances might be mentioned—but we refrain. We say again that we heartily sympathise with our brethren of the Church of England whose souls are oppressed by these burdens. Would that they could be relieved! Would that they could recover their just liberties! Would that the incubus of state-connection could be removed, and the power of self-government, restored! That revolution (and it *would* be a revolution) would be most propitious to the interests of "pure and undefiled religion." All denominations would rejoice in the glorious emancipation, and the Church of England would rise up in the dignity of holiness, blessed herself and blessing others. The benevolence and activity of her members would be evoked to a degree which has not been yet imagined, and she would be prepared for a career of unexampled usefulness. "Awake, awake, put on thy strength, O Zion; put on thy beautiful garments, O Jerusalem, the holy

city; for henceforth there shall no more come into thee the uncircumcised and the unclean." Isa. lli. 1.

There are other reasons why this bicentary celebration should be solemnised. A fitting tribute is due to the noble-minded men whose non-compliance with the Act of Uniformity drew down upon them such terrific vengeance. Rather than submit to requirements which they felt to be inconsistent with the demands of truth they sacrificed their earthly prospects and exposed themselves to poverty, privation, and the penalties of vindictive law. They might have saved themselves by hushing conscience to sleep, or by mental reservation, as it is supposed many have done since their time—but their moral sensibility forbade it. They "feared their God, and knew no other fear." All honour to them! Infidels laughed them to scorn;—magistrates gladly signed warrants of commitment;—judges browbeat juries and terrified them into adverse verdicts;—the rabble hooted them in the streets;—the gentle and noble stood aloof from them or secretly encouraged their tormentors;—all ranks and orders combined for a time to trample them under foot, while they in patience possessed their souls and looked to God for support and vindication. He gave them both; the support of his grace under the endurance of their woes, and ample vindication by the judgment of posterity. Alleine, and Baxter, and Bunyan are reverently listened to by countless numbers all the world over, but Jeffries is remembered only to be execrated. "The memory of the just is blessed, but the name of the wicked shall rot." Pro. x. 7.

Let it be admitted that the heroes of the ejectionment were not so fully enlightened on some subjects as those who now occupy their places, and perpetuate the name and profession of the Nonconformist. Yet theirs was a noble protest against unchristian legislation. They maintained that the church has no authority, either with or without the aid of the magistrate,

to impose on its members things in themselves indifferent ; that in the assertion and exercise of such authority there is an interference with the government of the Lord Jesus Christ, the only Head of the church ; and that those who object to any such impositions, whether on their own account or because of the principle involved, are justifiable in declining obedience and ought not to be compelled thereto. They pleaded for the rights of conscience, the freedom of the churches, and the honours of the divine lawgiver, and were resolved to make a firm stand against all encroachments. When they found that it was impossible to retain their positions without surrendering great principles and involving themselves in guilt, they peaceably withdrew,—forsook all and followed Christ.

There were many other servants of God in the kingdom who took much higher ground, denying altogether the power of the magistrate in matters of religion, and holding that not in doctrine only but also in constitution, government, worship and discipline, christian churches should be exclusively directed by the Word of God, repudiating all human tradition. They believed in the most extensive application of Chillingworth's celebrated saying—"The Bible, the Bible alone is the religion of Protestantism," and they acted in accordance with their belief. The storm of persecution fell on all parties alike. They adopted the same course, and were included in the same condemnation. Fellowship in suffering brought them often into friendly contact, placing them in circumstances favourable to interchange of thought and close investigation of truth. The outrages perpetrated under pretence of sustaining the form of religion by law established, and consented to by the ministers of that religion, would naturally lead the sufferers to enquire whether an institution so anti-christian in its outward working ought to be honoured as a christian church. Conviction followed inquiry. The adherents of non-conformity increased and multiplied, notwithstanding the vio-

lence of the persecution. "The bush burned with fire, and the bush was not consumed." It grew in the midst of the flames. At the close of the great struggle, when the glorious Revolution shed its blessings on the land, the nonconformist bodies presented an array of numbers that commanded respect and deference, and the spirit of freedom shone brighter and brighter. So it went on from year to year, gathering strength and influencing men in power, who, though they did not accept their religious opinions, admired and adopted the enlightened views on the religious liberty question which Nonconformists held and professed. The "middle party," by which appellation a considerable number of the ejected might have been at first designated, gradually melted away. Some few of them—very few—retraced their steps, and conformed. The majority were absorbed in the various denominations of dissenters, whose liberal opinions they embraced, and to whose progress they contributed their varied learning and talents.

Then came a conflict of another kind, continuing for more than a century, with alternations of success and defeat, answering to the positions of political parties. When Toryism was in the ascendant, religious freedom lost ground; when the Whigs prevailed, she took heart again. At length the peculiar badge of degradation was removed, by the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, in 1828, when the doors of office were thrown open to all good subjects, and Protestant Dissenters were restored to their rights and privileges. Other disabilities and restraints, some of them very vexatious, have been also taken away. The civil equality of all sects is now nearly attained in Great Britain.

Public opinion also has undergone a remarkable change. Doctrines which were universally popular between the Restoration and the Revolution are heard of no more. No respectable British Protestant would now hazard his reputation by propounding the slavish notions which were rife in those times,

were not unfrequently published by beat of "drum ecclesiastic," and were solemnly sanctioned by the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. With regard to religious liberty we are almost "of one heart and one soul." We say "almost," for here and there a grumbler is still to be found, and obstructiveness lingers in high places, as of old.

These obstacles, however, will be overcome. The tattered remnants of intolerance will soon be blown to the winds. The days of the Conventicle Act—and the Five Mile Act—and the Test and Corporation Acts—and the Schism Act, are gone for ever. The Act of Uniformity itself could not now be carried through the Imperial Parliament. A mis-named conservatism rallies round the Church-rates, and succeeds, for the present, in warding off the abolition of that obnoxious impost. But "there is a good time coming." Freedom's triumphs may be delayed but cannot be hindered. Religion will yet shine forth in her own glory—purified from corruption—unshackled by human law—"redeemed, regenerated, and disenthralled."

If we are called on to rejoice in the progress of religious liberty in the mother country, much more should we congratulate one another on the advanced position attained in the provinces of British North America. Here, we are under no religious restraint or disability. Pecuniary exactions for the support of the worship of a favoured sect are unknown. Our lands have never been tithed. Church-rates are unheard-of. The legislature interferes with none—protects all. In the eye of the law we are all equal. And we claim equality among ourselves. The Episcopalian minister is as important a man as the Presbyterian, and the Presbyterian is as great as the Baptist, and the Baptist is equal to the Methodist. As ministers of Christ they are all equal to one another—brethren—fellow-servants of the same Master—fellow-labourers in the same cause. They can meet on common ground for the promotion of great objects, religious or philanthropic. Baptists, Methodists, Episcopalians and Presbyterians unite in prayer for God's blessing on all, and even bishops preach in meeting houses. Here, then, Ephraim should not envy Judah, nor Judah vex Ephraim (Isa. xi. 13). Ambition, pride, contempt, contention should find no place; while all should be prepared to honour those, of whatever name or profession, whose superior attainments, holy lives, and self-denying activity

entitle them to distinction—and should cultivate the brotherly kindness and charity for which, in the early days of the Church, christians were admired by the world. The Nova-
scotians should gratefully say, "The lines are fallen unto me in pleasant places; yea, I have a goodly heritage." Psalm xvi. 6.

Two hundred years have passed away since the confessors of St. Bartholomew's day delivered their testimony. The world and the church have slowly grown wiser since that time. The folly and iniquity of persecution are all but universally confessed. Statesmen begin to see that religion lies not in the sphere of government, and that they ought to have nothing to do with the allocation of ministers, the regulation of church services, the imposition of creeds, or the enforcement of discipline.

"Let Caesar's dues be ever paid
To Caesar and his throne;
But consciences and souls were made
To be the Lord's alone."

—Watts.

Darkness, it is true, as yet hangs over Roman Catholic countries, the spirit of the Inquisition surviving where its form is seen no more, or is stripped of the old terrors of that hateful institution. Protestant Sweden and Denmark, and some of the petty principalities of Germany, continue to vex and annoy separatists from the established churches. But in Protestant States generally, the rights of conscience are acknowledged, and practical liberty is enjoyed. In all North America there is "freedom to worship God." Italy, too, in the old world, is rising into life and free action. Enlightened men of all nations give their adhesion to the glorious cause. Islamism itself, the fiercest of all systems, begins to abate of its ferocity, for Mahomedans in Turkey are now permitted to embrace the christian faith. Even China is giving up its exclusiveness, and toleration is proclaimed throughout that vast empire.

These are cheering signs of the times. And with them is connected the continual development of bible-extension, which may be justly regarded as the great moral phenomenon of the nineteenth century. God has wonderfully interposed for the churches. Profound and various learning, and gifts otherwise qualifying their possessors for usefulness in this department, have been consecrated to the high purpose; and

time after time the tidings reach us that another language has been won for the cross. Dialects of the most difficult and intricate character, or difficult from their very simplicity and scantiness of words, have been mastered and applied to holy uses; human instruments for the work have sprung up in the most unlikely quarters; and the word of the Lord is making its way among all lands, diffusing thoughts before unknown, and dispelling the gross darkness of heathen mythologies. Professing christians, also, of all denominations, are close students of Scripture, and the laws of the new dispensation are keenly searched into and scrutinised. Chillingworth's Protestant motto is better understood—its bearing and value more fully appreciated. Thousands of humble, truth-loving souls are exclaiming, "Speak, Lord, for thy servants hear." The results cannot be doubted. A glorious prospect is before us. The mists of tradition will vanish away. Christian faith and practice will be rigidly reduced to the ancient standard. Customs and laws unwarranted by holy writ will fall into disuse. Infringements on the prerogative of the "King of kings," the only Head of the Church, will be heartily repented of, confessed, and for ever abandoned. Every land will be full of religious men—though there will be no State-churches, and no Acts of Uniformity. Then, too, all church members will be members of Christ. For then, "the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea," and Jesus, "Lord of all," will be everywhere honoured and adored—and the divine will replace the human—and the kingdom of God will come with power, swaying all hearts, and penetrating the innermost man—and "the Sun of righteousness shall arise with healing in his wings." "Even so, come, Lord Jesus." "Come forth out of thy royal chambers, O Prince of all the kings of the earth! Put on the visible robes of thy Imperial Majesty; take up that unlimited sceptre which thy Almighty Father hath bequeathed thee; for now the voice of thy bride calls thee, and all creatures sigh to be renewed."*

*Milton.

APPENDIX.

No. I.

BAPTIST MINISTERS OF PARISH CHURCHES.

In the year 1654 a body of Commissioners was appointed, who were called "Triers," and whose duty it was to examine all persons presented or nominated to benefices, with a view to ascertain "the grace of God in them," and that they were persons of "holy and unblamable conversation, as also, for their knowledge and utterance, able and fit to preach the gospel." The object was to prevent the intrusion of improper men. The proceedings of the Commissioners were necessarily offensive to many, but the impartial confessed that on the whole much good resulted from the appointment.

Some few Baptist ministers were inducted into livings by the Triers. They preached in the parish churches, and received the proceeds of the endowments belonging to them. As they could not, consistently with their principles, admit the indiscriminate communion which had prevailed during the episcopal rule, the method said to have been adopted by Mr. Tombes at Fawdley may be regarded as descriptive of their general practice. He "gathered a separate church of those of his own persuasion, continuing at the same time minister of the parish."

The following is a list of Baptist ministers who were in possession of livings at the Restoration of Charles I:—

HENRY JESSEY, A. M. St. George's, Southwark, London.—
One of the best men of the age. Died in prison, Sept. 4, 1663

THOMAS EWINS, Bristol. Died April 20, 1670.

EDWARD BAGSHAW, A. M. Ambrosden, Oxfordshire. Died in prison, Dec. 28, 1671.

- JOHN TOMBS**, B. D. Leominster, Herefordshire. A learned man and a voluminous author. He was one of the "Triers." He relinquished the ministry and joined the Communion of the Church of England. Died May 25, 1676.
- GEORGE FOWNES**, A. M. High Wycombe, Bucks. Afterwards pastor of the church in Broadmead, Bristol. Died in Gloucester jail, Nov. 25, 1685.
- JEREMIAH MARSDEN**. Ardesley Chapel, near Wakefield, Yorkshire.
- ROBERT BROWNE**. White-Lady Aston, Worcestershire.
- DANIEL DYKE**, A. M. Hadham Magna, Herts. He was one of the "Triers." In 1668 he became co-pastor with the celebrated William Kiffin, of the Church in Devonshire Square, London. He died in 1688.
- RICHARD ADAMS**. Humberstone, Leicestershire. He succeeded Mr. Dyke at Devonshire Square, and lived to a very great age, being disabled from preaching for several years before his death, which took place in 1716.
- THOMAS QUARREL**. Some place in Shropshire. Died in 1709.
- WILLIAM DELL**, A. M. Yeldon, Bedfordshire, and Master of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.
- PAUL HOESON**. Chaplain of Eton College.
- THOMAS JENNINGS**. Brimsfield, Gloucestershire.
- PAUL FRIWEN**. Kempley, Gloucestershire.
- JOSHUA HEAD**. Some place in Gloucestershire.
- JOHN SMITH**. Wanlip, Leicestershire.
- THOMAS ELLIS**. Lopham, Norfolk.
- THOMAS EVANS**. Maesmynys, Brecknockshire.
- THOMAS PROUD**. Cheriton, Glamorganshire.
- JOHN MILES**. Ilston, Glamorganshire.
- THOMAS JOSEPH**. Llangyner, Glamorganshire.
- MORGAN JONES**. Llanmodeck, Glamorganshire.
- **ABBOT**. Abergavenny, Monmouthshire.
- WILLIAM WOODWARD**. Probably of Southwold, Suffolk.
- GABRIEL CAMELFORD**. Stavely Chapel, Westmoreland.
- JOHN SKINNER**. Weston, Herefordshire.
- JOHN DONNE**. Pertenhall, Bedfordshire. He was a fellow-prisoner with John Bunyan.
- JOHN GIBBS**. Newport Pagnell, Bucks.
- Walter Prossor, William Millman, Watkin Jones, Morgan Jones, Jenkin Jones, Ellis Rowland, and Roderick Thomas were ministers in various parts of Wales.

The following ministers, whose names are inserted by Mr. Ivimey in his list of ejected Baptists, (History of the Baptists, i. 328), did not become Baptists till after their ejection, viz:—Francis Bamfield, A. M., John Gosnold, Thomas Harcastle, Lawrence Wise, and Thomas Paxford.

No. II.

PIOUS SAYINGS OF THE EJECTED.

The collection of a few characteristic specimens of the utterances of Nonconformist experience in the seventeenth century may be instructive and edifying. The places mentioned are those from which the ministers were ejected.

EDMUND CALAMY, B. D. A'derbanbury, London. "Whoever goes out of God's way to avoid danger, shall meet with greater danger."

WILLIAM JENKYN, A. M. Christ-Church, Newgate Street, London. "If thou hast owned Christ when he was in rags, do not fear but he will own thee when he comes in his robes."—"There is a silent dignity in reproached piety, and a silent ignominy in advanced iniquity."

THOMAS BROOKS. St. Mary, Fish Street, London. "For wolves to worry the lambs is no wonder, but for one lamb to worry another is unnatural and monstrous."

THOMAS JACOMB, D. D. St. Martin's, Ludgate, London. "If God comes when the cross comes, the weight of it will never hurt you."

WILLIAM COOPER, A. M. St. Olave, Southwark, London. "Take heed lest through your hypocrisy you go to hell in the way of duty."—"As God condemns no man before he sins, so neither will he crown any man before he overcomes."

JOHN OWEN, D. D. "I am leaving the ship of the church in a storm; but whilst the great Pilot is in it, the loss of a poor under-rower will be inconsiderable."

SAMUEL CHARLES, A. M. Mickleover, Derbyshire. "A prisoner for Christ! Good Lord! what is this for a poor worm! 'Such honour have' not 'all his saints.' Both the degrees I took in the University have not set me so high as when I commenced prisoner for Christ."

ROBERT ATKINS, A. M. Exeter. "We will do any thing for his majesty but sin. We will hazard any thing for him but our souls. We hope we could die for him; only we dare not be damned for him."

JOHN HOWE, A. M. Great Torrington. "I expect my salvation, not as a profitable servant, but as a pardoned sinner."

GEORGE TROSSE, A. M. The following epitaph, written by himself, was placed on his tomb:—"Here lies the greatest of sinners, the least of saints, the most unworthy of preachers, George Trosse."

JOHN HOOK. Kingsworthy, Hampshire. "Some are condemned to an estate; others are exalted to poverty."—"We should learn to do natural things in a spiritual way, and spiritual things in a natural way."

MATTHEW MEAD. Shadwell, London. In his last illness, being asked how he did, he said, "Going home, as every honest man ought, when his work is done."

JOB TOOKIE. Yarmouth. "Prayer is the arrow love the bow that sends it forth—and faith the hand that draws the bow;—but when the bow is not strong, or the hand feeble that draws it, the arrow must needs fall short of the mark."

SAMUEL WINTER, D. D. "If you find yourself in the narrow way of sanctification, let God alone with the rest, to give you assurance of your future happiness, which he will do in his own time." Just before his death he said to those who stood by his bed-side, "Brother, sister, take death by the hand; be not afraid; death is a coward; he flies from me." Finding himself dying, he lifted up his eyes to heaven, saying, "Come, Lord Jesus"; and presently, with a smiling countenance, added, "Art thou come?"—and so breathed his last.

FRANCIS TALLENTS, A. M. Shrewsbury. "Let the work of God be done, and done well; but with as little noise as may be."

SAMUEL FAIRCLOUGH, A. M. Kedington, Suffolk. Being once thanked for a sermon, he said, "Pray, friend, give God the glory; no praise was due to the rams' horns, though the walls of Jericho fell at their blast."—"For a man to love another only because he is of his own opinion or party, is only hugging himself, and embracing his own shadow when it falls on another's breast."

THOMAS ROSEWELL, A. M. Sutton Mandeville, Wiltshire. "I would never wish ministers to remove from their people for temporal interest only. Let them look to a just and clear call in all their motions, otherwise they may taste, by bitter experience, the fruit of their doings."

JOHN SPILSBURY, A. M. Bromsgrove. "I shall not henceforward fear a prison as formerly, because I had so much of my Heavenly Father's company as made it a palace to me."

RICHARD BAXTER. Kidderminster. "I can as willingly be a martyr for love, as for any article of the creed." During his last illness, when asked how he did, he was accustomed to say, "Almost well"; and sometimes, "Better than I deserve to be, but not so well as I hope to be."

OLIVER HEYWOOD, B. D. Coley, Yorkshire. "I prize learning above all sublunary excellencies, and I might have been more useful had I improved my time better therein."

GEORGE EVANKE. Ayton Magna, Yorkshire. "How much soever God takes from you, it is less than you owe him; and how little soever he leaves you, it is less than he owes you; therefore, instead of murmuring that your condition is so ill, bless God that it is no worse."

PHILIP HENRY, A. M. Worthenbury, N. Wales. "Guilt in the soul is like a mote in the eye,—not at ease till wept out."—"Let him be afraid to die that is afraid to go to heaven."—"It were a good thought in a doubtful matter, What would Jesus Christ do if he were here?"

SAMUEL CLARK, A. M. Grendon, Bucks. "I find little savour or relish in dry crabbed notions, which have no influence upon practice. Now I grow old, such discourses as may prepare me for eternity, help me to further acquaintance and communion with God, and stir up my sluggish desires after him, are more suitable both to my necessities and inclinations."

JOHN BAILEY. Chester. "O that I may not be of the number of them that live without love, speak without feeling, and act without life!"—"If I can but exchange outward comforts for inward graces, 'tis well enough. O for a heart to glorify God in the fire!"

JOHN OLDFIELD. Carsington, Derbyshire. "When God will not use thee one way, he will in another. A soul that desires to serve and honour God shall never want opportunity to do it; nor must thou so limit the Holy One of Israel as to think that he hath but one way in which he can glorify himself by thee."

THOMAS DOWN, A. M. Exeter. When enduring excruciating pain he was accustomed to say, "I am upon my father's rack."

GEORGE HUGHES, B. D. Plymouth. "Free communion with God in prison is worth a thousand liberties gained with the loss of liberty of spirit. The Lord keep us his freemen!"

JOHN KNOWLES. Bristol. "I had rather be in a jail, where I might have a number of souls to whom I might preach the truths of my blessed Master, than live idle in my own house without any such opportunities."

(Selected from Palmer's "Nonconformists' Memorial," second edition, three volumes, 8vo.: London, 1803.)

